

INV J. GARCIA CN 019-1301 CEDED COPY

On October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019, Vanleeuwen willingly met with riverside county district attorney investigator Santana about Ex-fiancé Ramirez and her continued denials of his lawful visitations with his daughter Marjorie. Vanleeuwen indicated he attended the scheduled interview with paperwork and evidence to support violation of restraint by Ramirez (DVHE1903610 listing Vanleeuwen as protected), harassment against him and process servers, denials of leading him to seek further aid and protection in good faith.

On March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020, Vanleeuwen contacted me requesting I review the resulting reports from that interview submitted by Santana. Vanleeuwen seemed most concerned over the narrative of his interview which he claimed was dishonest. Vanleeuwen provided access to the reports. I then contacted [REDACTED] for access to any investigative recordings.

During review I was surprised to find that Santana did in fact misrepresent points in a very clear effort to frame Vanleeuwen as a liar. In the recorded interview I listened as Vanleeuwen indicated he and Ramirez had been in a relationship since the end of his time in Highschool. Vanleeuwen clearly indicated that Ramirez did not attend the same Highschool. When Santana posed the question, Vanleeuwen indicated Ramirez went to "NORTH".

I recognized this as the short name of a school in the area. I found that Vanleeuwen gave a very clear description of the situation and events surrounding his relationship with Ramirez. Santana seemed aware of the pleadings submitted by Vanleeuwen which provided further detail of the evidence in his favor, and in the district attorney's possession. Vanleeuwen stated his relationship with Ramirez had ended in 2016 after she was lied to and told that he cheated. When Santana apparently noticed Vanleeuwen still wore a wedding band, Vanleeuwen mentioned that it was primarily for his daughter Marjorie, explaining that as a child she didn't understand relationship issues and that she deserved to see and know he was still faithful to his promise.

In narrative, Santana falsely stated Vanleeuwen said he and Ramirez "had begun their romantic relationship in 2007-2008 while they were both in their senior year of Highschool". Santana was quick to mention that Ramirez graduated a year prior and from a different school, making it seem like he had caught Vanleeuwen in a lie. Santana continued to say Vanleeuwen had claimed his relationship with Ramirez had ended because of allegations of domestic violence. Santana did not mention a single statement made by Vanleeuwen in reference to his daughter Marjorie. Santana did not mention or list any of the pleadings or evidence provided to him by Vanleeuwen at the interview or in his office's possession. The fact this was a narrative presented to support probable cause and the fact his intent was so blatant [REDACTED]

ATTACHED TO CASE FILE FLHE - 19036190.

At point, its clear Santana intended to misrepresent the facts, conducting what appears a malicious investigation ignoring evidence of past, current and potentially ongoing criminal acts. I noted Santana reports working with Vaughan before ever meeting Vanleeuwen. (The riverside police investigator responsible for all current and past action against Vanleeuwen). I concluded Santana was aware of the conflict and that he had access to information regarding the unhealthy obsession and conduct presented by Vaughan. In March, 2019 after a riverside police officer [REDACTED] came forward about a fabricated violation created by Vaughan (Alleged) Vanleeuwen sought federal protection SI9CV04890204. Santana refers to this filing directly. I attempted to contact officer [REDACTED] but did not receive a response. Considering Santana misrepresents the matter using the same claims made by Vaughan in past allegations. It is likely Santana conspired directly with Vaughan to further personal interests.

**SUB103/20 MOD 05/20**

On January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Vanleeuwen was taken into custody by both Santana and Vaughan while attending family mediation for his daughter Marjorie. He was booked on alleged forgery, which investigators claim was considered kidnapping even though no violation of any court order was committed. These allegations garnered a default no-contact order against Marjorie. I concluded that under the notion contact secured paternal-right the added charge was likely intended to use the system default process to sever that connection. Vanleeuwen claims verbal abuse on arrest and being threatened with life in prison if he did not give up his daughter. I did not contact the witness who supported that claim. (See attached).

The alleged forgery resulted from a October 2019 interview with Mendiola, the processor who initially served the family summons. I noted she attempted service of additional documents and was threatened by Ramirez with false arrest by Vaughan for her attempt that day, months before the interview when both Santana and Vaughan appear at her home. (Copies of messages attached). At her home, reports indicate Mendiola continued to declare service until Vaughan mentioned arrest. Further review located a February 2019 interview Mendiola had with a licensed investigator where she talks about Vanleeuwens long term relationship with Ramirez and describes him as a loving father. She also says she is witness to some of Vaughan's conduct, labels him a credible threat and provides images of questionable comments and even a death threat on Vanleeuwen from an individual she names in conjunction with Vaughan. Considering the events, it is unlikely the allegations brought have any true merit.

Its obvious Forgery is an attempt to invalidate service, though it appears Ramirez was served with the summons multiple times before the allegations and her actions reflect considerable knowledge of the case. It should be noted that Mendiola never actually stated she was a witness to Forgery, only that the signature on the form wasn't hers after Vaughan

mentioned arrest. I was unable to locate Mendiola for comment. It is believed her claim was changed in fear.

I finally noted that Vanleeuwen had numerous judgements pending in other matters. It seemed off that investigators would wait until January to initiate arrest on material from October, especially since they claim Vanleeuwen is such a threat. However, since Vaughan enhances his bail to such an absurd amount preventing release, it might indicate Vaughan intended to impede January judgements that would continue labeling him an accomplice to crime. Many questions remain and it is unknown the extent of Vaughan's infatuation with Ramirez but evidence suggests a relation.

To note - It appears Vanleeuwen meets the legal definition of fatherhood. Vanleeuwen has not violated any court order or committed any action that would place another in fear. However, both Vaughan and Ramirez seem to. As a citizen Vanleeuwen has a right to claim any child for any reason. It is my opinion the legitimacy of all allegations against Vanleeuwen, past and present, should be questioned.

I concluded investigation action and referred Vanleeuwen to seek counsel from the county conflict panel.

END SUB N1

UPDATED 05/20